## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS **EASTERN DIVISION**

ADDONES SPENCER, REG. #11060-027

Petitioner,

No. 2:13-cv-00059-SWW-HDY VS.

ANTHONY HAYNES, Warden, FCI-Forrest City,

Respondent.

## ORDER

Before the Court is petitioner Addones Spencer's motion for a certificate of appealability [doc.#20]. A certificate of appealability certifies that the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right, that is, a showing that the issues are debatable among reasonable jurists, a court could resolve the issues differently, or the issues deserve further proceedings. See, e.g., Carson v. Director of the Iowa Dept. of Correctional Services, 150 F.3d 973, 975 (8th Cir. 1998).1

After reviewing the record in this case, this Court determines that the standard for a certificate of appealability is not met and that petitioner's motion seeking same should

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> With respect to claims that are procedurally barred, the Eighth Circuit has summarized the factors to consider when determining whether a certificate of appealability should issue when a habeas claim is denied on procedural grounds: "(1) if the claim is clearly procedurally defaulted, the certificate should not be issued; (2) even if the procedural default is not clear, if there is no merit to the substantive constitutional claims, the certificate should not be issued; but, (3) if the procedural default is not clear and the substantive constitutional claims are debatable among jurists of reason, the certificate should be granted." Khaimov v. Crist, 297 F.3d 783, 786 (8th Cir. 2002) (citing Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484-85 (2000)). See also Langley v. Norris, 465 F.3d 861, 863 (8th Cir. 2006).

be and hereby is denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 4<sup>th</sup> day of November 2013.

/s/Susan Webber Wright
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE